Noname manuscript No.
(will be inserted by the editor)

Extrapolated Quantum States, Void States, and a Huge Novel Class of Distillable Entangled States

Michel Boyer · **Aharon Brodutch** · **Tal Mor**

arXiv:1701.07757v1 [quant-ph] 26 Jan 2017

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

Abstract A nice and interesting property of any pure tensor-product state is that each such state has distillable entangled states at an arbitrarily small distance ε in its neighbourhood. We say that such nearby states are ε-entangled, and we call the tensor product state in that case, a "boundary separable state", as there is entanglement at any distance from this "boundary". Here we find a huge class of separable states that also share that property mentioned above – they all have ε-entangled states at any small distance in their neighbourhood. Furthermore, the entanglement they have is proven to be distillable. We then extend this result to the discordant/classical cut and show that all classical states (correlated and uncorrelated) have discordant states at distance ε, and provide a constructive method for finding ε-discordant states.

Keywords quantum computing and quantum information, entanglement, distillability, discord.

1 Introduction

Studying the structure of the set of quantum states has been a central topic in quantum information research (Bengtsson and Życzkowski 2006). Particular emphasis is on the tensor product structure of this space in terms of entanglement (Horodecki et al 2009) and general correlations (Modi et al 2012; Brunner et al 2014; Groisman et al 2007). The study has lead to the identification of important families of states such as Werner states (Werner 1989), bound entangled states (Horodecki 1997; Bennett et al 1999b), and the W-states (Dür et al 2000), as well as interesting sets of bases such as unextendable product bases (UPB) (Bennett et al 1999b) and locally indistinguishable bases (Bennett et al 1999a).

One method which has been particularly powerful in the study of state-space is interpolation, i.e.studying the states that lay between two known states with different properties. Interpolation has been used in the study of robustness to various types of noise (Vidal and Tarrach 1999) and learning about the ball of separable state (Braunstein et al 1999). The complementary method, extrapolation, has also been used in some cases for example in the study of non-signaling theories (Acín et al 2010) where trace one Hermitian operators with negative eigenvalues were required for larger than quantum violations of Bell inequalities.

Here we use both extrapolation and interpolation[1] to study the boundaries between various subsets of quantum spaces with particular emphasis on boundary separable states - separable states that are arbitrarily close to an entangled state cf. Definition 1.

Any pure tensor product state has entangled states near it, at any distance (i.e. arbitrarily close), making it boundary separable (cf. corollary 19) . Another simple example of a boundary separable state is a Werner-state $\lambda/3[\rho_{\psi_+}+\rho_{\varphi_+}+\rho_{\varphi_-}]+(1-\lambda)[\rho_{\psi_-}]$ (built from the four Bell states) with $\lambda = 1/2$ which has entangled states near it, at any distance.

Is the property of being separable yet having entangled states nearby at any distance common? Or is it rare? Furthermore, what can we learn about the type of entanglement that those nearby entangled states have? For two qubits, it

M. Boyer
DIRO, Université de Montréal, Canada,
E-mail: boyer@iro.umontreal.ca

A. Brodutch
Department of Physics & Astronomy and Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Canada,
E-mail: aharon.brodutch@uwaterloo.ca

T. Mor
Computer Science Department, Technion, Israel,
E-mail: talmo@cs.technion.ac.il

[1] A preliminary version of this work (without discordant states) appeared in TPNC-2014 (Boyer and Mor 2014).

is known (Horodecki et al 1997) that the entanglement is always distillable. For qudits, cf proposition 18.

Our main result is a number of families of boundary separable quantum states. We show that states in these families are arbitrarily close to distillable entangled states and give a constructive method for identifying these states. We also provide similar results for discord (cf. Corollary 23 for example), showing that all classical states (classically correlated and uncorrelated) are boundary classical (in fact there is a discordant and thus non classical state arbitrarily close) and providing a constructive way to find an arbitrarily close discordant state. Our results are presented in order of complexity starting from two qubit examples and continuing to more general results involving qutrits, qudits and multi-qubit systems. In most cases the results are presented through examples. The general implications are discussed at the end of each section.



Fig. 1 The set of quantum states is convex. A convex subset of those states are separable and its (non-convex) complement is the set of entangled state, at the boundary are the boundary separable states. Separable states are mostly dissonant (discordant and separable), the remainder are classical states with respect to A (correlated or uncorrelated). All classical states are boundary classical, but some are also boundary separable.

1.1 The set of quantum states

Given a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$, the set of quantum states (i.e.the set of positive semidefinite trace one Hermitian operators) on $\mathscr{H}$ is convex. If the Hilbert space has a physically meaningful tensor product structure $\mathscr{H} = \mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ it is useful and interesting to consider subsets of states based on this structure. These subsets are often not convex and are hard to characterize. In the work presented here we will use convex and affine mixtures of states to study the states that lay at the boundary of these subsets.

One important subset of states is the set of pure states $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ (i.e.states of rank 1). In this set we identify a smaller subset of pure product states of the form $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes |\varphi\rangle\langle\varphi|$. All pure states that are not product are called *entangled pure states*. Pure states are extremal points in the set of all states.

There are various ways to similarly divide the set of all states. One division is into the complementary subsets: separable states and entangled states. For any bipartite system whose Hilbert spaces are of dimension at least 2, both sets, entangled and separable, have a finite volume in the set of all states (Horodecki et al 2009). The set of entangled states is not convex and in general it is hard to identify whether a state is entangled or separable (Gurvits 2003). At the border between separable and entangled states are the boundary separable and ε- entangled states. Some properties of this boundary were previously studied in relation to non-linear entanglement witnesses (Gühne and Lütkenhaus 2007) where it was shown that the set of all separable states is not a polytope (see also Horodecki et al (2009)). Our main results are specific families of boundary separable and ε-entangled states; some of these families such as those close to thermal states are of particular importance in quantum computing. There are a number of physically meaningful ways to divide the set of entangled states. One that we will use here is to divide the set into two disjoint subsets, distillable and bound-entangled states. A state ρ is distillable if it is possible to distill many copies of ρ into a maximally entangled state. Clearly separable states cannot be distilled, but surprisingly there are entangled states that cannot be distilled. These are known as *bound entangled* states. It is known that states with a non-positive partial transpose are bound entangled, similarly if the total dimension of the Hilbert space is not larger than 6, all entangled states are distillable (and have non-positive partial transpose) (Horodecki et al 2009).

A different classification of the set of all states is into the complimentary subsets: Discordant states and states that are classical with respect to A (Modi et al 2012), the latter are sometimes called classical-quantum (see Sec. 2.5 for precise definitions). For simplicity we use $\mathcal{C}_A$ to denote the set of states that are classical with respect to A and note that the set of classical states, i.e.those that are classical with respect to both A and B, are a subset of $\mathcal{C}_A$. The set of discordant states is $\overline{\mathcal{C}_A}$. The classification into $\mathcal{C}_A$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_A}$ shares some properties with the classification of pure states. For example, like the set of pure product states which is vanishingly small in the set of all pure states (i.e.it requires strictly fewer parameters to characterize a pure product state than to characterize a generic pure state), the set $\mathcal{C}_A$ is vanishingly small in the set of all states (Ferraro et al 2010). Moreover, for pure states, discord and entanglement coincide. However, in general we can only say that entangled states are always discordant and classical states (with respect to A, B or both) are always separable. There is, an intermediate regime of discordant-separable or *dissonant* states (Modi et al 2010) (see fig. 1). As we will show below, all classical states (with respect to A, B or both) are also boundary classical, i.e. a state

is either discordant or there is a discordant state arbitrarily close to it.

Although discord refers to a specific quantity (Ollivier and Zurek 2001) other similar quantities exist (Modi et al 2012). Like entanglement monotones each measure has its own domain but generally there is an unambiguous way to quantify states as uncorrelated (product), classically correlated, dissonant (discordant and separable) and entangled (Modi et al 2012). A caveat on the last statement is that in general discord-like measures are not necessarily defined to be symmetric with respect to the parties involved and the cut between discordant and classical depends on this choice. Here we mostly consider the asymmetric versions that were discussed in the early literature, in particular the sets $\mathcal{C}_A$ and $\overline{\mathcal{C}_A}$; however all of our results apply to the various symmetric versions of discord in Modi et al (2012).

A final classification is in terms of the eigenvectors of the state. A state has a product eigenbasis[2] if it can be diagonalized in an orthonormal basis of product states. Surprisingly the decomposition of a state into eigenstates is not sufficient to tell us about entanglement or discord. In general non-degenerate separable states can have a non-separable eigenbasis (Groisman et al 2007). On the other hand a discordant state can have a product eigenbasis.

2 Notations and Terminology

2.1 General notation

In the majority of cases below we consider bipartite states as operators on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ (in Sec. 6 we also consider mulitipartite systems). We use T to denote the transpose map, similarly $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})$ denotes partial transposition on A. Distance between two states ρ and τ will be given by the trace distance $\delta(\rho,\tau)=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}|\rho-\tau|$.

2.2 Entanglement and separability

A convex mixture of pure states is called mixed. A quantum state ρ on $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ is called a product state if it can be decomposed into $\rho=\rho_A\otimes\rho_B$, where ρ_A and ρ_B are states on $\mathscr{H}_A$ and $\mathscr{H}_B$ respectively; ρ is called separable if it can be decomposed into a convex sum of product states, otherwise it is called entangled (cf Appendix A). Product states are also separable.

[2] The term product basis should not be confused with the *classical basis* of (Groisman et al 2007) which is a product of local bases, rather than a basis of product states.

2.3 Boundary Separable States and ε-Entangled States

Definition 1 A *boundary separable state* is a separable state ρ_b such that for *any* $\varepsilon>0$, there is an entangled state ρ_e for which $\delta(\rho_b,\rho_e)\le\varepsilon$, i.e. there are entangled states arbitrarily close to ρ_b.

Notice that for any density operator ρ, and $0\le\varepsilon\le 1$, if

$$\tau_\varepsilon=(1-\varepsilon)\rho_b+\varepsilon\rho \tag{1}$$

then $\delta(\tau_\varepsilon,\rho_b)=\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\mathrm{Tr}|\rho-\rho_b|=\varepsilon\delta(\rho,\rho_b)$ and thus

$$\delta(\tau_\varepsilon,\rho_b)\le\varepsilon\ .$$

The trace distance between τ_ε given by (1) and the (boundary) separable state ρ_b is at most ε but it may be much smaller than ε; it is ε iff $\delta(\rho,\rho_b)=1$ i.e. if ρ_b and ρ are orthogonal (have orthogonal support).

Definition 2 An *ε-entangled* state is an entangled state ρ_e such that there is a boundary separable state ρ_b for which $\delta(\rho_e,\rho_b)\le\varepsilon$; i.e. it is at trace distance at most ε from a boundary separable state.

As an example, the Werner state with $\lambda=1/2$ is a boundary separable state and mixing it with ρ_{ψ_-} gives ε-entangled states.

There are separable states ρ_b for which there exists a state ρ such that all the states τ_ε given by (1) are entangled for ε small enough, $\varepsilon\neq 0$. There is a continuous path starting from ρ_b and going straight in the direction of ρ whose initial section contains only ε-entangled states. Note that for $\varepsilon=0$ the resulting state τ_0 is the boundary separable-state ρ_b itself; $\tau_0=\rho_b$. As an example, again, the Werner state with $\lambda=1/2$ is a boundary separable state, such that mixing it with ρ_{ψ_-} as in (1) gives epsilon-entangled states, and there is a continuous path from this Werner state and all the way to the fully entangled state ρ_{ψ_-}.

2.4 "Extrapolated States" and "Void States"

Given any two states ρ_0 and ρ_1, the operators $\rho_t=(1-t)\rho_0+t\rho_1$ are clearly always Hermitian with trace 1; when $0\le t\le 1$, they are (mixed) states, all on a straight line segment between ρ_0 and ρ_1; those mixed states are obtained by *interpolation* (convex combination) of two states. Let us now introduce three additional definitions:

a) When $t<0$, ρ_t is on the same straight line but is no longer between ρ_0 and ρ_1; in general, if $\rho_0\neq\rho_1$ and all the eigenvalues of ρ_0 are strictly positive, then there are values of $t<0$ such that ρ_t is a state; we call such states *extrapolated states*.

Note that if $\rho_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $\rho_1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|$, then $(1-t)\rho_0 + t\rho_1 = (1-t)|0\rangle\langle 0| + t|1\rangle\langle 1|$ is not a state (it is not positive semi definite) as soon as $t < 0$ (or $t > 1$).
There may be some value $m < 0$ such that ρ_t is no longer positive semi-definite for $t < m$, thus no longer a state (hence it is not a physical entity), while it is still positive semi-definite for $t = m$.
The condition that the eigenvalues of ρ_0 be all positive is sufficient for defining extrapolated states, but not necessary. One can extrapolate carefully-chosen states that have some 0 eigenvalues. Extrapolation somewhat behaves like subtraction: if $t < 0$, then $\rho_t = (1+|t|)\rho_0 - |t|\rho_1$. We will be interested only with extrapolations with $t < 0$ though $t > 1$ could also provide extrapolations.

b) A *void state* is a quantum state that has exactly one zero eigenvalue. Namely, when diagonalized, it has exactly one zero on the diagonal.
c) A *k-void state* (of dimension $N > k$) is a quantum state that has exactly k zero eigenvalues[3] (similarly, it has rank $N-k$).

2.5 Discord and classical correlation

We consider a state ρ of a bipartite system AB with marginals ρ_A and ρ_B.

Proposition 3 *Let ρ be a state of $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ and $\{|i\rangle\}$ be a basis of $\mathscr{H}_A$. Then the following three statements are equivalent (Modi et al 2012).*

1. *There is a set of states $\{\tau_i\}$ on $\mathscr{H}_B$ such that*

$$\rho = \sum \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \tau_i,$$

with $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$.
2. *There is a set of unitary operators U_i such that*

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij} |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes U_i |j\rangle\langle j| U_i^\dagger,$$

where $\mu_{ij} \geq 0$ are the eigenvalues of ρ.
3. *ρ is invariant under the action of the local dephasing channel D defined by $D\Big(|i_1\rangle\langle i_2| \otimes \tau\Big) = \delta_{i_1 i_2} |i_1\rangle\langle i_2| \otimes \tau$ on the basis $\{|i\rangle\}$:*

$$D(\rho) = \rho.$$

Definition 4 The state ρ is said to be *classical with respect to the basis* $\{|i\rangle\}$ of $\mathscr{H}_A$ if it satisfies one of the above conditions.

[3] Note that a separable $N-1$-void state is a tensor product state.

These conditions imply that the decomposition $\rho_A = \sum_i \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i|$ with all $\lambda_i \geq 0$ is a necessary condition for ρ to be classical in the basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ (Brodutch and Terno 2010).

Definition 5 A state ρ is said to be *classical with respect to A* if there is a basis of $\mathscr{H}_A$ with respect to which it is classical; the set of classical states with respect to A is denoted $\mathcal{C}_A$. A state ρ which is not in $\mathcal{C}_A$ is called *discordant* (Modi et al 2012; Henderson and Vedral 2001; Ollivier and Zurek 2001) [4]. The set of discordant states is $\overline{\mathcal{C}_A}$.

Remark 6 It is important to notice that all classical states (i.e.classical with respect to both A and B) are in $\mathcal{C}_A$ and thus that a state not in $\mathcal{C}_A$ (i.e. discordant) cannot be classical. We will use that fact to build non classical (in fact, discordant) states arbitrarily close to any classical state.

Remark 7 Any state which is not product is called *correlated*. The set $\mathcal{C}_A$ contains both correlated and uncorrelated states while all states in $\overline{\mathcal{C}_A}$ are correlated. These are sometimes called *quantum correlated* (Modi et al 2012).

When $\rho_A = \sum_i \lambda_i |i\rangle\langle i|$ is non degenerate, i.e., $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ if $i \neq j$, the conditions above provide a very simple method to check if ρ is in $\mathcal{C}_A$ (Brodutch and Terno 2010). When ρ_A is degenerate one has to check over all its possible eigenbases.

2.5.1 Boundary classical states

In the same way as above it is possible to define boundary classical states and ε-discordant states. As we will see this definition is superfluous since all classical states are also boundary classical; cf. Corollary 23.

3 Two Qubits

Our first example of 2-party boundary separable-states (and the derived ε-entangled states) is obtained by starting from a completely mixed state and "fully subtracting" one of the eigenstates, to obtain a separable void state. Our second example uses a different—yet very interesting state to start with—the thermal state. As in the first example, a void-state is generated from the thermal state (via extrapolation) by subtracting one of the eigenstates. Our third example uses a 2-void state instead of a simple (1-)void state (and we also discuss here the case of 3-void state which in this case is a tensor product state). Our last two 2-qubit examples provide generalizations to less trivial cases including discordant states and separable states without a product eigenbasis. Since two qubit states that are entangled are all distillable (Horodecki et al 1997), the states obtained are thus also distillable.

[4] The term classical is used in a variety of ways in the literature, here we use it in the sense of correlations as in (Modi et al 2012)



Fig. 2 The interpolated and extrapolated Trace 1 Hermitian operators $(1-t)\rho_0+t\rho_1$. For $0\le t\le 1$ the operator is an (interpolated) state, i.e. it is a convex mixture of states and and we are guaranteed it is a state. For $t<0$ or $t>1$ the state is extrapolated. It will continue to be a state until one of the eigenvalues becomes negative. The states on the boundary are void states, they have at least one vanishing eigenvalue.

3.1 Example 1 – The Extrapolated Pseudo-Pure State of Two Qubits

Mixing a completely mixed state ρ_0 with an arbitrary state ρ_1 to yield the pseudo pure state (PPS) $\rho=(1-t)\rho_0+t\rho_1$ is found to be extremely useful in quantum information processing (e.g. in NMR quantum computing). To the best of our knowledge, an extrapolated state of the form $\rho=(1+|t|)\rho_0-|t|\rho_1$ was never used. This "extrapolated pseudo pure state" (EPPS), whenever it is a legal quantum state, shares with the conventional PPS the fact that applying any unitary transformation acts only on ρ_1.

An interesting special case of this EPPS is when $|t|$ is exactly sufficiently large to make one eigenvalue vanish (become zero). If ρ_1 is a pure tensor product state, then the resulting ρ is a void state. We assume here that the subtracted tensor product state is written in the computational basis, e.g., it is $|11\rangle\langle 11|$ and $m=t=-1/3$.

Proposition 8 *If the standard basis is the eigenbasis of a state ρ on $\mathscr{H}_2\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$, and if the eigenvalue of $|11\rangle$ is 0, and the other three eigenvalues are $1/3$, then there are states arbitrarily close to ρ that are entangled. [The same holds, with obvious adjustments, for any other tensor-product eigenstate that has a zero eigenvalue.]*

We avoid proving this proposition as we later (in example 4) prove a more general result, containing the above (and also example 2) as special cases. The above mentioned (very basic) example is mainly given for historical reasons, as it was the first example we found.

For j fixed, let

$$\rho=\frac{4}{3}\left[\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i=0}^{3}|i\rangle\langle i|\right]-\frac{1}{3}|j\rangle\langle j|=\frac{1}{3}\sum_{i=0;i\neq j}^{3}|i\rangle\langle i|.$$

This is obtained by choosing $|j\rangle$ (viewed as a two bit integer from $0=00_2$ to $3=11_2$) to be any product state $j\equiv j_{AB}=j_A\otimes j_B$, where the two parties are A for Alice's qubit and B for Bob's. In fact, for all values of t between 0 and $-1/3$, the Hermitian operators

$$\rho_t=(1-t)\left[\frac{1}{4}\sum_{i=0}^{3}|i\rangle\langle i|\right]+t|j\rangle\langle j|$$

are separable states; for $t<-1/3$, ρ_t is no longer a state since it is no longer positive semi definite, the eigenvalue of $|j\rangle$ becoming negative. Finally, if $|j\rangle=|11\rangle$, proposition 8 tells us that there are entangled states arbitrarily close to $\frac{1}{3}\sum_{i=0}^{2}|i\rangle\langle i|$.

3.2 Example 2 – The Thermal State of Two Qubits

The thermal state on two qubits is the state

$$\rho_\Theta=\frac{(1+\eta)^2}{4}|00\rangle\langle 00|+\frac{1-\eta^2}{4}\Big[|01\rangle\langle 01|+|10\rangle\langle 10|\Big]+\frac{(1-\eta)^2}{4}|11\rangle\langle 11|.$$

The state $|11\rangle$ is a 0-eigenstate of $\rho_p=(1+p)\rho_\Theta-p|11\rangle\langle 11|$ if $(1-\eta)^2(p+1)=4p$ and a proposition similar to proposition 8 can be written for ρ_p. However, both cases of Sections 3.1 and 3.2 will be dealt with, by a generalization done in example 4.

The thermal state will get more attention later on, when we discuss N qubits.

3.3 Example 3 — 2-Void State

Example 3, using a 2-void state, is as follows:

Proposition 9 *In $\mathscr{H}_2\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$ there are entangled states arbitrarily close to the state $\rho=\frac{1}{2}\Big[|01\rangle\langle 01|+|10\rangle\langle 10|\Big]$.*

Proof Here again, $|11\rangle$ is an eigenstate of ρ of 0 eigenvalue. Let $\rho_1=|\psi_+\rangle\langle\psi_+|$ with $|\psi_+\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\big[|01\rangle+|10\rangle\big]$ and $\rho_\varepsilon=(1-\varepsilon)\rho+\varepsilon\rho_1$. Then $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$, where T is the transpose operator, is

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})\begin{bmatrix}0&0&0&0\\0&1/2&\varepsilon/2&0\\0&\varepsilon/2&1/2&0\\0&0&0&0\end{bmatrix}=\begin{bmatrix}0&0&0&\varepsilon/2\\0&1/2&0&0\\0&0&1/2&0\\\varepsilon/2&0&0&0\end{bmatrix}$$

with characteristic equation $(\lambda-1/2)^2(\lambda^2-\varepsilon^2/4)=0$ and eigenvalues $1/2$, $\varepsilon/2$ and $-\varepsilon/2$; by the Peres criterion[5] (Peres 1996), ρ_ε is thus entangled for all $1>\varepsilon>0$ and, of course, $\delta(\rho,\rho_\varepsilon)\le\varepsilon$. □

[5] Although the Peres Criterion is well known, it is provided for completeness of the exposition in appendix A.

In fact, there was no need to solve the characteristic equation to show that $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$ is not positive semi definite. That can be seen directly from the matrix of $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$ because there is a 0 on the main diagonal for which the corresponding row and column are not zero: This is a consequence of the following well known lemma with $|\varphi\rangle = |11\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle = |00\rangle$; indeed, since by very definition of the partial transpose $\langle i_1 j_1|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|i_2 j_2\rangle = \langle i_2 j_1|\rho_\varepsilon|i_1 j_2\rangle$, it follows that $\langle 11|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|11\rangle = \langle 11|\rho_\varepsilon|11\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 11|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|00\rangle = \langle 01|\rho_\varepsilon|10\rangle \neq 0$.

Lemma 10 *Let A be a Hermitian operator on $\mathscr{H}$; if there are $|\varphi\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$ such that $\langle\varphi|A|\varphi\rangle = 0$ and $\langle\varphi|A|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ then A is not positive semi definite.*

Proof See appendix A.4.

3.4 Example 4 — A Generalization

Example 4 generalizes examples 1, 2 and 3:

Theorem 11 *If the standard basis is the eigenbasis of a state ρ on $\mathscr{H}_2\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$, and if the eigenvalue of $|11\rangle$ is 0, then there are states arbitrarily close to ρ that are entangled. The same holds for any other eigenstate and any product eigenbasis.*

Proof Let indeed

$$\rho = \lambda_{00}|00\rangle\langle 00| + \lambda_{01}|01\rangle\langle 01| + \lambda_{10}|10\rangle\langle 10|,$$

i.e. $|11\rangle$ has eigenvalue $\lambda_{11} = 0$. Let

$$\rho_1 = \rho_{\psi_+} = \frac{1}{2}\Big[|01\rangle\langle 01| + |01\rangle\langle 10| + |10\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|\Big]$$

and $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\rho_1$.

The partial transpose $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(|i_1 j_1\rangle\langle i_2 j_2|)$ on basis states being equal to $|i_2 j_1\rangle\langle i_1 j_2|$, it is clear that $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho) = \rho$. The partial transpose of ρ_1 is

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_1) = \frac{1}{2}\big[|01\rangle\langle 01| + |11\rangle\langle 00| + |00\rangle\langle 11| + |10\rangle\langle 10|\big].$$

If follows that

$$\langle 11|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|11\rangle = 0, \quad \langle 11|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|00\rangle = \frac{\varepsilon}{2};$$

by lemma 10, $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$ is not positive semi definite if $\varepsilon > 0$ and by the Peres criterion it follows that the state ρ_ε is then not separable; since $\delta(\rho,\rho_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$, there are states arbitrarily close to ρ that are not separable. □

Notice that all that is needed is that $\lambda_{11} = 0$. Nothing prevents $\lambda_{10} = \lambda_{10} = 0$. That implies, after a suitable choice of basis for the two systems, that any pure product state has arbitrarily close entangled states; being two qubit states, they are also distillable (Horodecki et al 1997), showing that there are arbitrarily close distillable states. By symmetry, the result clearly holds if any of the other eigenvalues is known to be 0 instead of λ_{11}. Moreover the choice of product basis is arbitrary and the same argument applies for any product basis.

3.5 Example 5. A discordant product state with a non-product eigenbasis

Take the discordant state

$$\varrho = \frac{1}{2}\big[|00\rangle\langle 00| + |{+}{+}\rangle\langle{+}{+}|\big],$$

where, this time, the representation is not spectral because $|00\rangle$, $|{+}{+}\rangle$, are not part of an orthonormal basis of $\mathscr{H}_2\otimes\mathscr{H}_2$; neither $|00\rangle$ nor $|{+}{+}\rangle$ is an eigenvector of ϱ. The state ϱ is equal to $\frac{1}{2}\left[|00\rangle\langle 00| + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{ijkl}|ij\rangle\langle kl|\right]$ and is represented, in the standard basis, by the matrix

$$\frac{1}{8}\begin{bmatrix} 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

The state $|{+}{+}\rangle$ being equal to $\frac{1}{2}[|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle$, it is easy to check that the states $|\psi_0\rangle = \dfrac{|00\rangle + |{+}{+}\rangle}{\sqrt{3}}$ and $|\psi_1\rangle = |00\rangle - |{+}{+}\rangle$ are normalized and orthogonal, and also that

$$\varrho = \frac{3}{4}|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| + \frac{1}{4}|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1|.$$

Since the spectral decomposition is unique, this shows that the spectral decomposition of ϱ has eigenvectors that are not separable even though ϱ is itself separable: separability of a state does not imply that its eigenbasis is made out of separable states.

As we will see in sections 3.6 and 4 the absence of a separable eigenbasis is not a necessary and sufficient condition for discord.

Proposition 12 *If $\rho = \frac{1}{2}\big[|00\rangle\langle 00| + |{+}{+}\rangle\langle{+}{+}|\big]$ and $\rho_{\varphi_+} = |\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_+|$ with $|\varphi_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|00\rangle + |11\rangle]$, then for $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$, the states $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\rho_{\varphi_+}$ are all entangled.*

Proof Clearly $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho) = \rho$. Also

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_{\varphi_+}) = \frac{1}{2}\big[|00\rangle\langle 00| + |10\rangle\langle 01| + |01\rangle\langle 10| + |11\rangle\langle 11|\big]$$

Let $|\psi_-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|01\rangle - |10\rangle]$. A simple calculation shows that

$$\langle\psi_-|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_{\varphi_+})|\psi_-\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle\psi_-|\rho|\psi_-\rangle = 0$$

It follows that $\langle\psi_-|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|\psi_-\rangle = -\varepsilon/2$ which shows directly that the partial transpose of ρ_ε is not positive semi-definite for $\varepsilon > 0$. The state ρ_ε is consequently entangled and the discordant state ρ is boundary separable. □

3.6 Example 6 - A Classical-Quantum state

As mentioned in the introduction (sec 1.1) the definition of discord is asymmetric. The following state is classical with respect to A, but it is not classical with respect to B; it becomes discordant under the interchange of the subsystems $A \leftrightarrow B$. Such states are often called classical-quantum (Modi et al 2012).

Proposition 13 *Let*

$$\rho = \lambda_{00}\,|00\rangle\langle 00| + \lambda_{01}\,|01\rangle\langle 01| + \lambda_{1+}\,|1+\rangle\langle 1+| + \lambda_{1-}\,|1-\rangle\langle 1-| \tag{2}$$

If any of the eigenvalues is 0*, then there are states arbitrarily close to* ρ *that are entangled.*

Proof This time we first prove if $\lambda_{00} = 0$ i.e. if

$$\rho = \lambda_{01}\,|01\rangle\langle 01| + \lambda_{1+}\,|1+\rangle\langle 1+| + \lambda_{1-}\,|1-\rangle\langle 1-|.$$

Let again $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}\left[|01\rangle\langle 01| + |01\rangle\langle 10| + |10\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|\right]$ and $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\rho_1$. Then $\langle 00|(\mathrm{T}\otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 00|(\mathrm{T}\otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|11\rangle = \varepsilon/2$ so that ρ_ε is not positive semi-definite by Lemma 10 and ρ_ε is thus entangled by the Peres criterion. Had we written explicitly the matrix, we would have seen the following pattern

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon) \quad = \quad \begin{array}{c} \\ 00 \\ 01 \\ 10 \\ 11 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccc} 00 & 01 & 10 & 11 \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & \varepsilon/2 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ \varepsilon/2 & & & \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

with a 0 entry on the main diagonal for which the line is not identically 0 and concluded that $(\mathrm{T}\otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$ is not positive semi definite if $\varepsilon \neq 0$.

In this proof, it was assumed that $\lambda_{00} = 0$ but the same result holds if the eigenvalue of any other basis element is 0; for instance, if the eigenvalue of $|1-\rangle$ is 0, then applying $X \otimes XH$ maps the basis onto itself and $|1-\rangle$ onto $|00\rangle$; for $|1+\rangle$ we need to apply $X \otimes H$, and for $|01\rangle$ we apply $I \otimes X$. □

The state in equation (2) has a product eigenbasis. We can make it discordant by interchanging the subsystems $A \leftrightarrow B$ in which case it is a discordant state with a product eigenbasis.

3.7 Two qubits - discussion

In this section we provided a number of examples of boundary separable states. More generally, we showed (Theorem 11) that any two qubit state which has a product basis and is not full rank is on the boundary. We also showed that separable states may have eigenstates which are not separable (example 5) and that discordant states can have a separable eigenstates (example 6).

4 Two qutrits

Some of the subtleties of bipartite systems cannot be seen in qubit-qubit pairs and qubit-qutrit pairs. These include UPBs and bound entangled states (Bennett et al 1999b) and locally indistinguishable product states (Bennett et al 1999a).

4.1 A mixture of locally indistinguishable product states

Consider the following states on a bipartite system where $|a \pm b\rangle$ denotes the state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|a\rangle \pm |b\rangle]$.

$$\begin{array}{ll} |\psi_1\rangle = |1\rangle & |1\rangle \\ |\psi_2\rangle = |0\rangle & |0+1\rangle \\ |\psi_3\rangle = |0\rangle & |0-1\rangle \\ |\psi_4\rangle = |2\rangle & |1+2\rangle \\ |\psi_5\rangle = |2\rangle & |1-2\rangle \\ |\psi_6\rangle = |1+2\rangle & |0\rangle \\ |\psi_7\rangle = |1-2\rangle & |0\rangle \\ |\psi_8\rangle = |0+1\rangle & |2\rangle \\ |\psi_9\rangle = |0-1\rangle & |2\rangle \end{array} \tag{3}$$

Proposition 14 *The state* $\rho_0 = 1/8 \sum_{i=2}^{9} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ *is boundary separable.*

Proof Let $|\Psi_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|01\rangle + |10\rangle]$ and $\rho_1 = |\Psi_+\rangle\langle\Psi_+|$. Thus $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{2}\left[|01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10| + |01\rangle\langle 10| + |10\rangle\langle 01|\right]$. Let $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1$. For $2 \leq i \leq 9$, $\langle 01|\psi_i\rangle = 0$ or $\langle\psi_i|10\rangle = 0$ so that $\langle 01|\rho_0|10\rangle = 0$ and thus $\langle 01|\rho_\varepsilon|10\rangle = \varepsilon/2$. Also $\langle 11|\rho_0|11\rangle = \langle 11|\rho_1|11\rangle = 0$ and so $\langle 11|\rho_\varepsilon|11\rangle = 0$. It follows that $\langle 11|(\mathrm{T}\otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|11\rangle = \langle 11|\rho_\varepsilon|11\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 11|(\mathrm{T}\otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|00\rangle = \langle 01|\rho_\varepsilon|01\rangle = \varepsilon/2 \neq 0$ and thus, for $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ ρ_ε is entangled. □

See appendix C for a matrix based argumentation.

The states in eq (3) cannot be distinguished using local operations (Bennett et al 1999a) a property sometimes called *non-locality without entanglement*. In Brodutch and Terno (2010) it was shown that given a set of states and a prior probability distribution, there is no relation between discord in the resulting mixed state and this property. Similarly a mixture of these 9 states is generally discordant with a product eigenbasis.

5 Two Qudits (Quantum Digits)

We now consider bipartite systems, with each part of dimension at least two.

5.1 The ball of separable states

Proposition 15 *All states ρ in the finite ball $Tr|\rho - \frac{1}{d}\mathrm{I}| < \frac{1}{d}$ are separable and not boundary separable.*

Proof We know from the Gurvits-Barnum bound (Gurvits and Barnum 2002) that all states ρ with $\|\rho - \frac{1}{d}\mathrm{I}\|_2 < \frac{1}{d}$ are separable. Using the fact that $\|\cdot\|_2 \leq Tr|\cdot|$ we can see that the maximally mixed state and any state close enough to it is not boundary separable. □

Corollary 16 *There are separable states that are not boundary separable.*

5.2 A general class of boundary separable states

We now consider states of bipartite systems $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ for which $\dim \mathscr{H}_A \geq 2$ and $\dim \mathscr{H}_B \geq 2$.

Lemma 17 *Let ρ_0 be a state such that $\langle 00|\rho_0|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 10|\rho_0|01\rangle = 0$. Let ρ_1 be such that $\langle 00|\rho_1|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 10|\rho_1|01\rangle = re^{i\varphi}$ with $r > 0$. Then $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho_0 + \varepsilon\rho_1$ is entangled and distillable for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.*

Proof The conditions on ρ_0 and ρ_1 imply that

$$\langle 00|\rho_\varepsilon|00\rangle = (1-\varepsilon)\langle 00|\rho_0|00\rangle + \varepsilon\langle 00|\rho_1|00\rangle = 0, \quad (4)$$

$$\langle 10|\rho_\varepsilon|01\rangle = (1-\varepsilon)\langle 10|\rho_0|01\rangle + \varepsilon\langle 10|\rho_1|01\rangle = \varepsilon re^{i\varphi}. \quad (5)$$

From (4) and (5) it follows that $\langle 00|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 00|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|11\rangle = \varepsilon re^{i\varphi} \neq 0$ and consequently $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$ is not positive semi-definite and ρ_ε is entangled. We can do better. Let $|\Psi_\theta\rangle = \sin(\theta)|11\rangle - e^{i\varphi}\cos(\theta)|00\rangle$. Then, since $\langle 00|\rho_\varepsilon|00\rangle = 0$, $\langle 01|\rho_1|10\rangle = \overline{\langle 10|\rho_1|01\rangle} = re^{-i\varphi}$ and $\langle\Psi_\theta| = \sin(\theta)\langle 11| - e^{-i\varphi}\langle 00|$, il follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle\Psi_\theta|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|\Psi_\theta\rangle \\ &\quad = \sin^2(\theta)\langle 11|\rho_\varepsilon|11\rangle - 2\sin(\theta)\cos(\theta)r\varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

If $\langle 11|\rho_\varepsilon|11\rangle = 0$, the result is negative for $0 < \theta < \pi/2$. Else for all $r\varepsilon \neq 0$ there exits θ such that $\langle 11|\rho_\varepsilon|11\rangle < 2\cot(\theta)r\varepsilon$ i.e.such that $\langle\Psi_\theta|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)|\Psi_\theta\rangle < 0$, which implies that ρ_ε is entangled and distillable by a lemma of Kraus et al (2002) (cf. appendix B).

We shall now consider separable void states with a separable 0 eigenvector. They are not only boundary separable but independently of the dimensions (larger than 2), they have arbitrarily close distillable entangled states.

Proposition 18 *Let ρ be a separable state of a bipartite system $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ ($\dim \mathscr{H}_A \geq 2$, $\dim \mathscr{H}_B \geq 2$) that has a product state $|\varphi_0\psi_0\rangle$ as eigenstate with 0 eigenvalue. Then ρ is boundary separable; moreover there are entangled states arbitrarily close to ρ that are distillable.*

Proof We may assume that $|\varphi_0\rangle = |0\rangle_A$ and $|\psi_0\rangle = |0\rangle_B$ (cf Appendix A and B) so that $|\varphi_0\psi_0\rangle = |00\rangle$ (dropping the indices A and B, as was done till now) and perform the partial transpose using the basis $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$, etc, of $\mathscr{H}_A$. Since ρ is separable, $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ is a state and, from $\langle 00|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)|00\rangle = \langle 00|\rho|00\rangle = 0$, it follows that $|00\rangle$ is a 0 eigenvector of $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ and thus $\langle 00|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)|11\rangle = 0$ i.e. $\langle 10|\rho|01\rangle = 0$. Let now ρ_1 be any state such that $\langle 00|\rho_1|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 10|\rho_1|01\rangle \neq 0$. The conditions of Lemma 17 are satisfied and $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\rho_1$ is entangled and distillable for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$. □

Corollary 19 *All pure product states are boundary separable.*

5.3 Discordant states

Proposition 20 *: If ρ and τ are classical with respect to the basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ then so is the state $(1-t)\rho + t\tau$ for any valid t.*

Proof That follows directly from Proposition 3. □

Theorem 21 *: The state $(1-t)\frac{\mathrm{I}}{d} + t\rho$ is discordant if and only if ρ is discordant, where* I *is the identity of $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$ and $d = \dim(\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B)$.*

Proof This follows directly from statement 4 in Proposition 3 and the fact that I is invariant under any dephasing channel. □

Proposition 22 *Consider the state*

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j} \mu_{ij}|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes U_i|j\rangle\langle j|U_i^\dagger,$$

with the standard basis chosen such that the smallest eigenvalue is μ_{00} and $U_0 = \mathrm{I}$. Let ρ_1 be any state of the bipartite system s.t. $\langle 00|\rho_1|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 10|\rho_1|01\rangle \neq 0$; then the state $\rho_\varepsilon = (1-\varepsilon)\rho + \varepsilon\rho_1$ is a discordant state for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$.

Proof Let $\rho_v = \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{1-d\mu_{00}}(\mu_{ij} - \mu_{00})|i\rangle\langle i| \otimes U_i|j\rangle\langle j|U_i^\dagger$ if $\rho \neq \frac{\mathrm{I}}{d}$ (the μ_{ij} are not all equal), else let $\rho_v = |00\rangle\langle 00|$; then $\rho = z\rho_v + (1-z)\frac{\mathrm{I}}{d}$ for $z = 1 - d\mu_{00}$, $0 \leq z \leq 1$, $\langle 00|\rho_v|00\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 10|\rho_v|01\rangle = 0$. From proposition 21 we know that ρ_ε is discordant if and only if the state $\hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon,z} = k\rho_{\varepsilon,z}$ obtained by normalizing $\rho_{\varepsilon,z} = (1-\varepsilon)z\rho_v + \varepsilon\rho_1$ is discordant. It holds that $\hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon,z} = (1-\varepsilon')\rho_v + \varepsilon'\rho_1$ with $\varepsilon' = k\varepsilon$ ($0 < \varepsilon' \leq 1$). By Lemma 17, $\hat{\rho}_{\varepsilon,z}$ is entangled (and distillable), so that ρ_ε is discordant and ρ is boundary classical. □

Corollary 23 *All classical states are boundary classical.*

We note that one could arrive at corollary 23 by using the fact that the set of classical states is nowhere dense (Ferraro et al 2010).

Proposition 22 provides a method to construct ε-discordant states. If a classical state ρ (or any state $\rho \in \mathcal{C}_A$) is not boundary separable the ε-discordant state is also dissonant (i.e.it is separable). In general there is no direct relation between discord and boundary separable states.

Proposition 24 *There are classical states (and states in $\mathcal{C}_A$) that are boundary separable and discordant states that are not boundary separable*

Proof Most of the examples of boundary separable states above are classical with respect to A. Moreover all pure product states are also uncorrelated and boundary separable.

From proposition 21 and we know there are discordant states arbitrarily close to the maximally mixed states. From proposition 15 we know that these states are not boundary separable. □

5.4 Two qudits - discussion

In this section we showed that there are separable states that are not boundary separable (corollary 16). We then presented a general class of boundary separable states and showed that in general all pure product states are boundary separable (Corollary 19). Finally we discussed depolarized discordant states (Theorem 21), showed that all classical states are boundary classical (Corollary 23) and that there is no direct relation between discord and boundary separable states.

6 Multiple qubits

6.1 Extrapolated Pseudo-Pure States of N Qubits

Let us consider states of the form

$$\rho_t = (1-t)\frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N} + t|11\ldots1\rangle\langle 11\ldots1|$$

where I is the identity matrix, but this time of size $2^N \times 2^N$, and $t < 0$. With $(1-t_b) + 2^N t_b = 0$ i.e. $t_b = -\frac{1}{2^N-1}$, $\rho_b = \rho_{t_b}$ becomes a 1-void state, with $|11\ldots1\rangle$ as 0-eigenvector. The states ρ_t for $t_b \le t \le 0$ are all clearly separable; their matrix is diagonal in the standard basis, with non negative eigenvalues. Only the eigenvalue of $|11\ldots1\rangle$ decreases.

6.1.1 ρ_b Is a Boundary Separable State.

We choose arbitrarily the first bit and show that there are ε close entangled states for which the first qubit is entangled with the others. Let $|\mathbf{1}\rangle = |1^{N-1}\rangle$, i.e. $N-1$ bits equal to one. The eigenstate of ρ_b with 0 eigenvalue can be written as $|1^N\rangle = |1\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ and Proposition 18 applies.

6.1.2 Trace Distance Between ε-Entangled States and the Completely Mixed State.

The trace distance between ρ_b and $\mathrm{I}/2^N$ is

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\left|(1-t_b)\frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N} + t_b|1^N\rangle\langle 1^N| - \frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N}\right| = \frac{|t_b|}{2}\mathrm{tr}\left|\frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N} - |1^N\rangle\langle 1^N|\right|.$$

The trace of $\left|\mathrm{I}/2^N - |1^N\rangle\langle 1^N|\right|$ is $(2^N-1)\times 1/2^N + 1 - 1/2^N = 2 - 2/2^N$. The trace distance is thus

$$\delta(\frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N}, \rho_b) = \frac{1}{2^N-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2^N}\right) = \frac{1}{2^N}$$

. Conclusion: for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are entangled states at distance at most $2^{-N} + \varepsilon$ of the completely mixed state. Indeed, by the triangle inequality,

$$\delta(\frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N}, \rho_\varepsilon) \le \delta(\frac{\mathrm{I}}{2^N}, \rho_b) + \delta(\rho_b, \rho_\varepsilon) \le 2^{-N} + \varepsilon$$

.

6.2 The N Qubit Thermal State

The thermal state of one qubit is

$$\rho_\Theta = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1+\eta}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1-\eta}{2} \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1+\eta}{2}\,|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1-\eta}{2}\,|1\rangle\langle 1|.$$

The thermal state of N independent qubits (with the same η) is

$$\rho_\Theta^N = \rho_\Theta^{\otimes N} = \sum_{i\in\{0,1\}^N}\left(\frac{1+\eta}{2}\right)^{N-|i|}\left(\frac{1-\eta}{2}\right)^{|i|}|i\rangle\langle i|.$$

where $|i|$ is the Hamming weight of the string i, i.e. the number of bits equal to 1 in i, each 1 giving a minus sign, and each 0 a plus sign. The thermal state is not only separable but it has an eigenbasis consisting of product states The smallest eigenvalue is given by the eigenvector $|i\rangle = |1^N\rangle$, i.e. all qubits are 1 and it is

$$\lambda_{|1^N\rangle} = \left(\frac{1-\eta}{2}\right)^N$$

which is exponentially small with N.

6.2.1 Extrapolated States Close to the Thermal State.

Let us consider the extrapolated states

$$\varrho_t = (1-t)\rho_\Theta^N + t|1^N\rangle\langle 1^N|$$

for $t < 0$ ($t = -p$ for some positive real number p). They are all separable and when the eigenvalue of $|1^N\rangle\langle 1^N|$ becomes 0,

ϱ_t is a void state. That happens when $(1-t)\left[(1-\eta)/2\right]^N + t = 0$ i.e

$$t_b = -\frac{\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}}{1-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}} = -\lambda_{|1^N\rangle} - \lambda^2_{|1^N\rangle} - \dots$$

a very small value, equal to $-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle} = -((1-\eta)/2)^N$ if we neglect terms of higher order. The trace distance between ϱ_b and ρ^N_Θ is

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(\varrho_b, \rho^N_\Theta) &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}\left|(1-t_b)\rho^N_\Theta + t_b|1^N\rangle\langle 1^N| - \rho^N_\Theta\right| \\ &= \frac{|t_b|}{2}\operatorname{tr}\left|\rho^N_\Theta - |1^N\rangle\langle 1^N|\right|.\end{aligned}$$

The eigenvectors of $\rho^N_\Theta - |1^N\rangle\langle 1^N|$ are those of ρ^N_Θ and the eigenvalues are left unchanged except for the eigenvector $|1^N\rangle$ whose eigenvalue of $\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}$ is decreased by 1 which implies that the sum of the absolute values of the eigenvalues is increased by $1-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\delta(\rho^N_\Theta, \varrho_b) &= \frac{|t_b|}{2}\left(2-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\frac{\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}}{1-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}}\left(2-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda_{|1^N\rangle} + \frac{\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}}{1-\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}}\right) \\ &= \lambda_{|1^N\rangle} + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2_{|1^N\rangle} + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^3_{|1^N\rangle}\dots\end{aligned}$$

which is $\lambda_{|1^N\rangle}$ if we neglect terms of higher order. That distance is exponentially small with N.

6.2.2 ϱ_b Is a Boundary Separable State.

We now show that there are entangled states arbitrarily close to ϱ_b. We choose again arbitrarily the first bit and show that there are ε close entangled states for which the first qubit is entangled with the others. Let $|\mathbf{1}\rangle = |1^{N-1}\rangle$, i.e. $N-1$ bits equal to one, and let $|\nu\rangle$ be any $N-1$ bit string with at least one bit equal to zero. The eigenstate of ϱ_b with 0 eigenvalue is $|1^N\rangle = |1\rangle|\mathbf{1}\rangle$. Proposition 18 applies again.

6.2.3 Entangled States Close to the Thermal State

We have just proven that or any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are entangled states ϱ_ε such that $\delta(\varrho_b, \varrho_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$. By the triangle inequality (since the trace distance is a distance in the sense of metric spaces), the distance between those states ϱ_ε and ρ^N_Θ is such that

$$\delta(\rho^N_\Theta, \varrho_\varepsilon) \leq \delta(\rho^N_\Theta, \varrho_b) + \delta(\varrho_b, \varrho_\varepsilon) \leq \delta(\rho^N_\Theta, \varrho_b) + \varepsilon$$

which implies that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there are entangled states in a ball of trace-distance radius

$$\varepsilon + \left(\frac{1-\eta}{2}\right)^N + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1-\eta}{2}\right)^{2N} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1-\eta}{2}\right)^{3N}\dots$$

around the thermal state ρ^N_Θ of N qubits where $\left(\frac{1-\eta}{2}\right)^N = \lambda_{|1^N\rangle}$ is exponentially small in N.

7 Discussion

We used extrapolation and interpolation to study the boundaries of some subsets of states and to make some connections between different notions of entanglement and quantum correlations. The majority of our results concern boundary separable states. We showed various classes of these states that play a significant role in quantum computing. In particular the classically correlated states in the computational basis and thermal states.

Our results are related to results on robustness against various types of noise. States near the boundary are generally more fragile than those far away from it. It is then interesting to note that although thermal states are not entangled they can become entangled by small fluctuation in the right direction, moreover the entanglement is distillable.

7.1 Discord and entanglement

While discord and entanglement are very different from an operational perspective (Modi et al 2012; Brodutch 2013), pure state entanglement and discord (for all states) share many similar mathematical properties (Modi et al 2012). Many of these appeared in the work above, in particular in the property of boundaries. All classical states are boundary classical (Corollary 23), similarly all pure product are at the boundary of the set of entangled states (Corollary 19). This opens a number of interesting questions regarding operations on pure and mixed states. For example we showed in proposition 22 that mixing any classical state (and any classical state with respect to A) with an entangled state will make it discordant, similarly mixing a pure product state with an entangled state will make it entangled (Corollary 19). However the former is not an extension of the latter into mixed states since both take pure states to a mixed states. If one considers unitary operations on pure states there is come discrepancy. Universal entanglers (unitary operations that entangle all pure states) are known to exits only in higher dimensions (Chen et al 2008).

7.2 Quantum computing

It is currently an open question whether it is possible to efficiently simulate all quantum computations that produce (or consume) no entanglement (Boyer Brodutch and Mor 2017). Surprisingly, it is not even clear if it is possible to simulate all quantum computation that produce (or consume) no discord. Boundary (classical or separable) states may play a critical role in these types of simulations since even small errors can cause the states to become discordant or entangled. This issue was pointed out for the case of discord free (concordant) computation in (Cable and Browne 2015) where the entire computation happens on the boundary (see also (Datta and Shaji 2011)).

A second issue is related to the entangling power of mixed state quantum computers, where the initial state is fixed. Here we showed that the thermal states used in various mixed state models can become entangled after a small perturbation. However, we did not discuss the physical mechanism for such perturbations. In a follow up paper (Boyer Brodutch and Mor 2017) we explore perturbations due to unitary operations that are ϵ close to the identity. A question for future research involves the possible use of thermal states and some non-local operations to distill entanglement. This question is especially important in the setting of NMR quantum computing.

Acknowledgments

MB was partly supported by NSERC and FCAR through INTRIQ. AB was partly supported by NSERC, Industry Canada and CIFAR. TM was partly supported by the Israeli MOD. AB and TM were partly supported The Gerald Schwartz & Heather Reisman Foundation. AB is currently at the Center for Quantum Information and Quantum Control at the University of Toronto.

References

Acín A, Augusiak R, Cavalcanti D, Hadley C, Korbicz JK, Lewenstein M, Masanes L, Piani M (2010) Unified framework for correlations in terms of local quantum observables. Phys Rev Lett 104:140,404, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.140404

Bengtsson I, Życzkowski K (2006) Geometry of quantum states: an introduction to quantum entanglement. Cambridge University Press

Bennett CH, DiVincenzo DP, Fuchs CA, Mor T, Rains E, Shor PW, Smolin JA, Wootters WK (1999a) Quantum nonlocality without entanglement. Phys Rev A 59:1070–1091, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.59.1070

Bennett CH, DiVincenzo DP, Mor T, Shor PW, Smolin JA, Terhal BM (1999b) Unextendible product bases and bound entanglement. Phys Rev Lett 82:5385–5388, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.82.5385

Boyer M, Mor T (2014) Extrapolated states, void states, and a huge novel class of distillable entangled states. In: Dediu AH, Lozano M, Martín-Vide C (eds) Theory and Practice of Natural Computing, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 8890, Springer International Publishing, pp 107–118, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-13749-0_10

Boyer M, Brodutch A, Mor T (2017) Entanglement and deterministic quantum computing with one qubit arXiv:1606.05283

Braunstein SL, Caves CM, Jozsa R, Linden N, Popescu S, Schack R (1999) Separability of very noisy mixed states and implications for nmr quantum computing. Phys Rev Lett 83:1054–1057, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.1054

Brodutch A (2013) Discord and quantum computational resources. Phys Rev A 88:022,307, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.88.022307

Brodutch A, Terno DR (2010) Quantum discord, local operations, and maxwell's demons. Phys Rev A 81:062,103, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.81.062103

Brunner N, Cavalcanti D, Pironio S, Scarani V, Wehner S (2014) Bell nonlocality. Rev Mod Phys 86:419–478, doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.86.419

Cable H, Browne D (2015) Exact and efficient simulation of concordant computation N. J. Phys. 17:113049 doi: 10.1088/1367-2630/17/11/113049

Chen J, Duan R, Ji Z, Ying M, Yu J (2008) Existence of universal entangler. J Math Phys 49(1):012103, doi: 10.1063/1.2829895

Datta A, Shaji A (2011) Quantum Discord and Quantum Computing - An Appraisal Int. J. Quant. Info. 9:1787 doi: 10.1142/S0219749911008416

Dür W, Vidal G, Cirac JI (2000) Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways. Phys Rev A 62:062,314, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.62.062314

Ferraro A, Aolita L, Cavalcanti D, Cucchietti FM, Acín A (2010) Almost all quantum states have nonclassical correlations. Phys Rev A 81:052,318, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.81.052318

Gühne O, Lütkenhaus N (2007) Nonlinear entanglement witnesses, covariance matrices and the geometry of separable states. J Phys: Conf Ser 67(1):012,004, doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/67/1/012004

Groisman B, Kenigsberg D, Mor T (2007) "Quantumness" versus "classicality" of quantum states. arXiv:quant-ph/0703103

Gurvits L (2003) Classical deterministic complexity of edmonds' problem and quantum entanglement. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM, New York, NY, USA, STOC '03, pp 10–19, doi: 10.1145/780542.780545

Gurvits L, Barnum H (2002) Largest separable balls around the maximally mixed bipartite quantum state Phys. Rev. A 66:062311 – doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.66.062311

Henderson L, Vedral V (2001) Classical, quantum and total correlations. J Phys A: Math Gen 34(35):6899, doi: 10.1088/0305-4470/34/35/315

Horodecki M, Horodecki P, Horodecki R (1997) Inseparable two spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ density matrices can be distilled to a singlet form. Phys Rev Lett 78:574–577, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.574

Horodecki P (1997) Separability criterion and inseparable mixed states with positive partial transposition. Phys Lett A 232(5):333 – 339, doi: 10.1016/S0375-9601(97)00416-7

Horodecki R, Horodecki P, Horodecki M, Horodecki K (2009) Quantum entanglement. Rev Mod Phys 81:865–942, doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.81.865

Kraus B, Lewenstein M, Cirac JI (2002) Characterization of distillable and activatable states using entanglement witnesses. Phys Rev A 65:042,327, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.65.042327

Modi K, Paterek T, Son W, Vedral V, Williamson M (2010) Unified view of quantum and classical correlations. Phys Rev Lett 104:080,501, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.080501

Modi K, Brodutch A, Cable H, Paterek T, Vedral V (2012) The classical-quantum boundary for correlations: Discord and related measures. Rev Mod Phys 84:1655–1707, doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.84.1655

Ollivier H, Zurek WH (2001) Quantum discord: A measure of the quantumness of correlations. Phys Rev Lett 88:017,901, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.017901

Peres A (1996) Separability criterion for density matrices. Phys Rev Lett 77:1413–1415, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.77.1413

Vidal G, Tarrach R (1999) Robustness of entanglement. Phys Rev A 59:141–155, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.59.141

Werner RF (1989) Quantum states with einstein-podolsky-rosen correlations admitting a hidden-variable model. Phys Rev A 40:4277–4281, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.40.4277

Appendix

A The Peres Entanglement Criterion

Here are a few relevant remarks using the notations of the main article.

A.1 Transpose and partial transpose

Given a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ and a basis $\{|i\rangle\}$ (we always assume finite dimensional systems), the transpose is defined by linearity on basis operators $|i_1\rangle\langle i_2|$ by $\mathrm{T}(|i_1\rangle\langle i_2|) = |i_2\rangle\langle i_1|$. It follows that for any linear operator L, $\langle i_1|\mathrm{T}(L)|i_2\rangle = \langle i_2|L|i_1\rangle$. If ρ is a state and $\rho = \sum_i \lambda_i |\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$, one can check that $\mathrm{T}(\rho) = \sum_i \lambda_i |\overline{\varphi}_i\rangle\langle\overline{\varphi}_i|$ where $|\overline{\varphi}\rangle = \sum_i \overline{a}_i |i\rangle$ if $|\varphi\rangle = \sum_i a_i|i\rangle$, $\overline{a}_i$ being the complex conjugate of a_i. It follows that $\mathrm{T}(\rho)$ is also a state, with same eigenvalues as ρ.

Given a compound system described by $\mathscr{H}_A \otimes \mathscr{H}_B$, the partial transpose with respect to the A system is simply the operator $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})$ i.e.

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})\Big(|i_1\rangle\langle i_2|\otimes|j_1\rangle\langle j_2|\Big) = |i_2\rangle\langle i_1|\otimes|j_1\rangle\langle j_2|$$

on basis elements. It also follows that for any operator L on $\mathscr{H}_A\otimes\mathscr{H}_B$

$$\langle i_1 j_1|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(L)|i_2 j_2\rangle = \langle i_2 j_1|L|i_1 j_2\rangle$$

A.2 The Peres Criterion

A state ρ of a bipartite system $\mathscr{H}_A\otimes\mathscr{H}_B$ is said to be *separable* if it can be written in the form

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i^A \otimes \rho_i^B \qquad\qquad p_i \geq 0,\ \sum_i p_i = 1 \tag{6}$$

where the ρ_i^A (resp. ρ_i^B) are states of $\mathscr{H}_A$ (resp. $\mathscr{H}_B$); if ρ is not separable, it is said to be *entangled*. If ρ is given by (6), then

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho) = \sum_i p_i \mathrm{T}(\rho_i^A)\otimes\rho_i^B$$

and since the $\mathrm{T}(\rho_i^A)$ are states, this implies that $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ is itself a state (and separable). This implies in turn that $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ must be positive semi-definite. As a consequence, if $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ is not positive semi-definite, then ρ is not separable, i.e. it is entangled. That is the statement of the Peres Criterion of entanglement (Peres 1996).

A.3 Checking for positivity

An operator P is positive semi-definite if it is Hermitian and if for all pure states $|\varphi\rangle$, $\langle\varphi|P|\varphi\rangle \geq 0$ (iff P has no negative eigenvalue). For any state ρ of $\mathscr{H}_A\otimes\mathscr{H}_B$, $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ is always Hermitian. To prove that it is not positive semi-definite, we need only find a $|\Psi\rangle$ such that $\langle\Psi|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)|\Psi\rangle < 0$. The partial transpose however depends on the basis chosen for $\mathscr{H}_A$. We now show (using our notations) that whether $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)$ is positive semi-definite or not does not depend on the choice of that basis. Indeed, let $|e_i\rangle$ be any orthonormal basis of $\mathscr{H}_A$. Then ρ can always be written (in a unique way) as $\rho = \sum_{ij}|e_i\rangle\langle e_j|\otimes\rho_{ij}$ where the ρ_{ij} are operators of $\mathscr{H}_B$. Let T_e be the transpose operator in the basis e i.e. $\mathrm{T}_e(|e_i\rangle\langle e_j|) = |e_j\rangle\langle e_i|$. Then

$$(\mathrm{T}_e\otimes I)(\rho) = \sum_{ij}\mathrm{T}_e(|e_i\rangle\langle e_j|)\otimes\rho_{ij} = \sum_{ij}|e_j\rangle\langle e_i|\otimes\rho_{ij}$$

$$(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho) = \sum_{ij}T(|e_i\rangle\langle e_j|)\otimes\rho_{ij} = \sum_{ij}|\overline{e}_j\rangle\langle\overline{e}_i|\otimes\rho_{ij}$$

The $|\overline{e}_i\rangle$ also form an orthonormal basis of $\mathscr{H}_A$. Now let $|\Psi_e\rangle = \sum_i |e_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$ be any pure state of $\mathscr{H}_A\otimes\mathscr{H}_B$. Then $|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i|\overline{e}_i\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$ is also a pure state and

$$\langle\Psi|(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho)|\Psi\rangle = \langle\Psi_e|(\mathrm{T}_e\otimes I)(\rho)|\Psi_e\rangle = \sum_{ij}\langle\psi_j|\rho_{ij}|\psi_i\rangle$$

A.4 Proof of Lemma 10

Proof Let us assume P is positive semidefinite: $P = \sum_i \lambda_i|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|$ with $\lambda_i \geq 0$. If $\langle\varphi|P|\varphi\rangle = 0$, then $\sum_i\lambda_i|\langle\varphi|\varphi_i\rangle|^2 = 0$ and $\lambda_i\langle\varphi|\varphi_i\rangle = 0$ for all i and thus $\langle\varphi|P|\psi\rangle = \sum_i\lambda_i\langle\varphi|\varphi_i\rangle\langle\varphi_i|\psi\rangle = 0$ for all $|\psi\rangle$. □

B Distillability

Note that the Peres Criterion is not a characterization. If the partial transpose of ρ is positive semi-definite, ρ may still be entangled. Furthermore, if a state $\rho_{ppt\text{-}ent}$ is entangled and admits a positive partial transpose then it is not distillable (namely, one canot distill a singlet state out of many copies of $\rho_{ppt-ent}$ via local operations and classical communication). Such states are said to have "bound entanglement". A characterization of distillable states can be found in Horodecki (1997). Here is the lemma as we use it, as stated in Kraus et al (2002).

Lemma 25 (Kraus et al (2002); Horodecki (1997)) *A state ρ of $\mathscr{H}_A\otimes\mathscr{H}_B$ is distillable if and only if there exists a positive integer N and a state $|\Psi\rangle = |e_1 f_1\rangle + |e_2 f_2\rangle$ such that*

$$\langle\Psi|\,(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})(\rho^{\otimes N})\,|\Psi\rangle < 0,$$

where $\{e_1,e_2\}$ (resp. $\{f_1,f_2\}$) are two unnormalized orthogonal vectors of $\mathscr{H}_A^{\otimes N}$ (resp. $\mathscr{H}_B^{\otimes N}$).

C Proof of Proposition 14 using matrices

When the states $|ij\rangle$ are put in lexicographic order, the partial transpose $(\mathrm{T}\otimes\mathrm{I})$ corresponds to transposing blocks in the block matrix, whereas $(\mathrm{I}\otimes\mathrm{T})$ corresponds to transposing each of the blocks individually. The matrix of Proposition 14 is a 3×3 block matrix, with 3×3 blocks.

We first calculate for both ρ_0 and ρ_1 the entries $(11,11)$ and $(01,10)$ (row 01, column 10 of their matrix). Those are $\langle 11|\rho_0|11\rangle = 0$, and $\langle 01|\rho_0|10\rangle = 0$ for ρ_0 and $\langle 11|\rho_1|11\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 10|\rho_1|10\rangle = 1/2$ for ρ_1. Those values were obtained in the main text. The matrices for ρ_0 and ρ_1 are then the following (useless entries being kept blank).

	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
00									
01				0					
02									
10									
11					0				
12									
20									
21									
22									

	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
00									
01				1/2					
02									
10									
11					0				
12									
20									
21									
22									

Then, the 3×3 block matrix is transposed, giving respectively for $(\mathrm{T} \otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_0)$ and $(\mathrm{T} \otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_1)$ the matrices:

	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
00									
01									
02									
10									
11	0				0				
12									
20									
21									
22									

	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
00									
01									
02									
10									
11	1/2				0				
12									
20									
21									
22									

The matrix of $(\mathrm{T} \otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon) = (1-\varepsilon)(\mathrm{T} \otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_0) + \varepsilon(\mathrm{T} \otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_1)$ is then

	00	01	02	10	11	12	20	21	22
00									
01									
02									
10									
11	$\varepsilon/2$				0				
12									
20									
21									
22									

We see clearly that the matrix of $(\mathrm{T} \otimes \mathrm{I})(\rho_\varepsilon)$ has a 0 diagonal entry for which there is a non zero entry on the corresponding row (or corresponding column). That implies that the matrix is not positive semi-definite and consequently that ρ_ε is entangled.

Of course, the blank values in the density operator for ρ_1 could take any value without affecting the result; in fact any density operator ρ_1 such that $\langle 11|\rho_1|11\rangle = 0$ and $\langle 01|\rho_1|10\rangle \neq 0$ could have been used instead to give entangled states that arbitrarily close to ρ_0.